

Marine Life Protection Act Initiative



Preliminary Proposal Evaluations – Potential Fishery Impacts in the North Central Coast Study Region

Presentation to the MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force November 19, 2007 • San Rafael, CA Prepared by Dr. Astrid Scholz



Overview

- 1. Introduction
- 2. Overview of Fisheries
- 3. Impact on commercial fishing grounds: Approach
- 4. Impact on commercial fishing grounds: Assessing MPA proposals
- 5. Socioeconomic impact analysis: Approach
- 6. Socioeconomic impact analysis: Assessing MPA proposals



1. Introduction

- Interviewed 174 commercial fishermen on spatial extent and relative importance of their fishing grounds
- · Will have similar data available for recreational fisheries in study region by RSG working group meeting 28 Nov 2007
- · These layers form the basis for design of arrays, and two evaluation analyses:
 - First order effects of closing areas (size and value), "worst case"
 Socioeconomic impacts of MPA arrays

Fishery	% of total NCCSR fisheries revenues, 7-year average (2000–2006)	% of total CA statewide fisheries revenues, 7-year average (2000–2006)	% of CA statewide fisheries revenues landed in NCCSR, 7-year average (2000–2006)
California Halibut	1.8%	0.3%	20.5%
Coastal Pelagics	0.2%	0.0%	0.4%
Market Squid	1.9%	0.4%	1.2%
Deeper Nearshore Rockfish	0.7%	0.1%	23.9%
Nearshore Rockfish	1.0%	0.2%	7.2%
Urchin	5.2%	1.0%	8.5%
Dungeness Crab	53.2%	10.0%	31.1%
Salmon	36.1%	6.8%	52.7%



3. Commercial Impacts: Approach

- Distinguish between total fishing grounds, and fishing grounds in state waters
- Stated importance * proportion of study area landings
- Assume that all commercial fishing in an area affected by an MPA would be lost completely
 <u>overestimates</u> the impacts
- In reality fishing effort would shift, but can't predict where and when



3. Commercial Impacts: Next Rounds

- In subsequent rounds of MPA proposals, will also consider "outliers" – fishermen likely to experience disproportionate impacts
- Effect of existing fishery management area closures and other constraints on fishing grounds
- Other pieces of information that would be useful to you!



4. Commercial Impacts: Results

- MPA proposals vary considerably, both between and across fisheries:
- Table 7: percentage of total fishing grounds area affected
- Table 8: percentage of study area fishing grounds affected
- Table 9: percentage of total fishing grounds value affected
- Table 10: percentage of study area value affected

_	Fisheries	Turquoise A	Turquoise B	Emerald A	Emerald B	Jade A	Jade B	External A	External B	External	External D
Γ	California Halibut							-			
ı	Coastal Pelagics										
L	Market Squid	-	-	-	-	-		-	-		-
oint Aren	Deeper Nearshore Rockfish	29.41%	30.52%	31.46%	62.80%	51.67%	27.94%	23.20%	34.03%	55.48%	32.45%
oin	Nearshore Rooldish	14.32%	14.84%	16.04%	33.43%	27.39%	14.84%	11.57%	17.61%	29.53%	16.54%
۴	Urchin	12.37%	14.10%	12.40%	12.24%	10.92%	8.34%	4.23%	9.73%	11.51%	10.47%
ı	Dungeness Crab	4.07%	3.79%	3.01%	4.79%	9.04%	1.80%	0.57%	2.31%	9.51%	3.15%
ı	Salmon	0.91%	0.86%	1.46%	0.96%	1.78%	0.47%	0.19%	0.50%	5.44%	0.46%
Γ	California Halibut	9.55%	10.78%	14.48%	8.44%	23.22%	8.38%	12.88%	7.15%	27.60%	9.74%
ı	Coastal Pelagics		_	-	-	-		-	-	-	
Ļ	Market Squid		_	-	-	-		-	-	-	
ga Bay	Deeper Nearshore Rockfish	11.52%	14.15%	17.42%	14.39%	15.90%	9.29%	9.95%	10.07%	23.73%	11.40%
Bodega	Nearshore Rockfish	7.19%	8.33%	8.52%	14.15%	9.96%	4.22%	3.62%	6.70%	10.08%	7.17%
r	Urchin	11.89%	12.77%	13.25%	14.46%	10.94%	8.15%	4.55%	9.61%	10.87%	9.73%
ı	Dungeness Crab	1.50%	1.59%	2.00%	2.49%	3.72%	1.14%	0.40%	0.92%	5.69%	1.05%
L	Salmon	0.47%	0.49%	0.65%	0.61%	0.71%	0.30%	0.13%	0.30%	1.73%	0.34%
ı	California Halibut	9.95%	11.17%	14.64%	9.09%	23.92%	8.60%	12.75%	7.38%	28.07%	9.82%
ı	Coastal Pelagics	-	-					-			
ı	Market Squid	-	-	-		-		-	-	-	
Bolinas	Deeper Nearshore Rockfish	40.95%	33.79%	59.29%	14.63%	31.80%	11.84%	28.47%	9.22%	79.44%	4.05%
å	Nearshore Rockfish	-	-	-				-	-	-	
ı	Urchin	-	-	-	-			-	-		
ı	Dungeness Crab	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	20.09%	0.00%	3.17%	0.00%	10.89%	0.00%
L	Salmon	0.80%	1.01%	1.99%	0.55%	0.59%	0.39%	0.33%	0.29%	5.63%	0.26%
ı	California Halibut	2.19%	2.93%	4.45%	2.19%	6.60%	1.80%	3.02%	1.53%	8.28%	2.42%
ı	Coastal Pelagics	-	-					-			
00	Market Squid	-	-	-		-		-	-	-	-
an Francisco	Deeper Nearshore Rockfish	14.63%	15.78%	13.89%	12.97%	16.35%	11.26%	9.27%	10.38%	18.56%	6.24%
i i	Nearshore Rockfish	14.51%	16.66%	12.24%	13.59%	16.48%	10.02%	11.00%	9.22%	17.76%	7.37%
99	Urchin	30.75%	32.64%	28.80%	35.86%	27.39%	21.65%	12.71%	28.63%	26.00%	24.36%
ı	Dungeness Crab	1.38%	1.51%	1.93%	2.47%	3.47%	1.07%	0.39%	0.87%	5.34%	1.02%
L	Salmon	0.47%	0.49%	0.65%	0.61%	0.71%	0.30%	0.13%	0.30%	1.73%	0.34%
L	California Halibut	5.91%	9.49%	11.05%	10.84%	9.45%	5.72%	5.17%	5.32%	16.09%	6.46%
L	Coastal Pelagics	0.84%	0.84%	0.81%	0.81%	0.84%	0.84%	0.00%	0.00%	0.84%	0.81%
8 3/	Market Squid	12.38%	24.97%	19.72%	19.06%	20.27%	2.63%	0.11%	2.63%	32.21%	11.83%
Half Moon 8	Deeper Nearshore Rockfish	20.72%	20.51%	19.06%	17.58%	20.68%	13.56%	10.03%	10.80%	27.51%	7.01%
Ě	Nearshore Rockfish	9.48%	9.48%	9.48%	53.45%	9.48%	9.48%	6.90%	9.48%	40.37%	9.05%
۱Ĕ	Urchin	-	-	-	-			-	-		
L	Dungeness Crab	1.95%	2.12%	2.64%	3.43%	4.96%	1.51%	0.53%	1.19%	7.63%	1.35%
L	Salmon	0.51%	0.56%	0.76%	0.70%	0.78%	0.32%	0.14%	0.35%	1.95%	0.37%



5. Socioeconomic Impact Analysis: Approach

- Builds on approach developed by Wilen and Abbott (2006) in last round
- One important improvement: We collected actual cost data

Mean % of Gross	Economic	Revenue
-----------------	----------	---------

Name	n=	Crew	Fuel	Fixed	Total			
California Halibut	19	5.4%	13.9%	26.6%	45.9%			
Coastal Pelagics	1	40.0%	15.0%	5.0%	60.0%			
Squid	1	40.0%	15.0%	5.0%	60.0%			
Deeper Nearshore and Nearshore Rockfish	18	5.3%	17.3%	28.3%	50.9%			
Dungeness Crab	101	14.8%	10.3%	23.3%	48.5%			
Urchin	21	7.6%	10.7%	21.4%	39.7%			
Salmon	138	9.8%	11.8%	25.0%	46.6%			
All Fisheries Combined	174	10.9%	12.1%	24.4%	47.5%			



